

REMARKS

The last Office Action and the Advisory Action have been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Thoney.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Thoney in view of the patent to Kubota.

Claims 4, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Thoney in view of the patent to Borrelli.

Also, the disclosure is objected to for some informalities.

Finally, the Examiner indicated that claim 2 is not rejected over the art.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the disclosure, applicants have amended the specification and claims to provide

corresponding abbreviations and spellings of the elements. It is believed that the Examiner's grounds for the formal objections are therefore eliminated.

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of claim 2 has been gratefully acknowledged. In connection with this indication, this claim has been canceled and a new claim 8 was submitted which combines the features of the original claims 1 and 2. It is believed that this claim is now in allowable condition.

In connection with the Examiner's rejection of the claims over the art, applicants have canceled claim 1 without prejudice. Claim 3 has been amended to depend on claim 8. It is therefore believed that claim 3 should be allowed as well.

At the same time, applicant has amended claims 4, 5, 6, 7, to introduce into them the subject matter of claim 2, which was considered as allowable by the Examiner. In particular, these claims now define that the doping with Ce constitutes 5-200% of a concentration of the laser-active ions in mol %. It is respectfully requested to allow claims 4-7 as well. If the Examiner however disagrees, he is respectfully requested and authorized to cancel claims 4-7; however, the applicant's preference would be to retain

these claims and to allow them since they contain the allowable subject matter of claim 8.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233